

be abolished among the civilized and educated. As to the question of courage a modern writer remarks:

“Honor has been spoken of, and the necessity of keeping up the spirit and courageous habits of the people; but honor consists in doing nothing wrong, or base, or unlawful, not in murdering, or being murdered; and in regard to courage, we need but say, that the bravest nations never knew the existence of such a practice, and the bravest men have ever set their faces against it. The Romans and the Greeks were utterly unacquainted with such a degrading and absurd custom; they needed no such means of showing their courage. Brutus and Scipio, Pericles and Leonidas, Alexander and Cæsar, Epaminondas and Themistocles, found means of establishing the reputation of brave men without turning their swords against their friends and companions; while many a man who goes forth to fight another according to the evil practice of the present day is, in truth, a coward; a coward to prejudices which he feels to be unreasonable and to the opinions of men whom he thoroughly despises. At all events, he is a murderer, according to the law of God, and according to the law of man. Those who encourage him in the act are accessaries to the crime; the judge who gives such a charge as knowingly to induce a jury to acquit him is culpable before God, his country and mankind; and the jury, which by its verdict pronounces him not guilty, violates the oath administered to it on entering that court.

Those who have most strenuously exerted themselves to put down this barbarous crime, have generally been men so eminent for their courage, as to be beyond all suspicion of fear. Gustavus Adolphus—he whose person was the mark of every imperial soldier—he who at the head of his cavalry, was found in the thickest of every fight, and who died covered with wounds in the moment of victory—utterly abolished it from his army, and gave an example of what might be done by a great king, a fearless man and a wise legislator, to put a stop even to a vice which assumed the name of virtue. Richelieu effected the same thing in France during his administration. In latter times, we have seen Frederick the Great, and the present stern and upright ruler of the mighty Republic of the United States, direct their efforts to the same great cause; and Colbert, at the period of which we are speaking—a man whom no personal fears could turn for one moment from any just and honorable object—now urged upon Louis XIV., a sovereign distinguished for his personal bravery and for his approbation of every species of courage, to treat with the utmost severity a crime which was a proof of any thing but a virtue which they both admired.”

Pennsylvania, in her proposed new constitution, has the following provision—“any person who shall, after the adoption of the amendments proposed by this convention to the constitution, fight a duel or